

REMARKS

Claims 20-47, 62-75, and 77-82 are pending in the application. Claims 81 and 82 have been newly added. Claims 20, 28, 42, 62, 70, and 74 have been amended. Support for the newly added claims and the amendments can be found, e.g., page 21, lines 11-23; page 2, lines 3-15; and in Figures 8 and 9. No new matter has been added. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of claims 20-47, 62-75, and 77-82.

Examiner Interview

During an interview held on October 25, 2005 and attended by Erik Swenson and Julie Skoge, counsel to the Applicants, the Examiner agreed that in principal the proposed independent claims 20, 28, 42, 62, 70, and 74 were different than the applied art. Additionally, during the interview, examples of "locations personal to the user" were discussed. In light of the discussion, the Applicants have amended independent claims 20, 28, 42, 62, 70, and 74 as proposed in the interview.

Section 102 Rejections

Claims 28-47 and 62-73 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Obradovich et al. (US 6,529,824, hereinafter "Obradovich"). Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection is overcome.

Claim 28, as amended, recites, in part, a computerized method for producing a customized weather map for a geographic area. The method includes sending a request to a server for weather map data, obtaining the weather map data from a source of weather map data, and producing a new customized weather map. The method further includes personalizing the customized weather map by adding labels indicating locations of personal interest to the user. Examples of such labels are given in Figures 8 and 9 (e.g., "My House," "Campus," and "Lambeau Field"). These labels have meanings personal to a particular user and may be different for each.

In contrast, Obradovich discloses a personal communication device (PCD) that can request and receive preconstructed maps, such as weather maps, from various data providers. *See e.g.* column 11, lines 33-52. Obradovich fails to disclose or suggest personalizing the

customized weather map by adding labels indicating locations of personal interest to the user. For at least these reasons, Obradovich does not anticipate or suggest claim 28. Claims 29-33 depend from claim 28 and are allowable for at least the same reasons. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of claims 28-33.

Claim 34 recites, in part, a computerized system for producing a customized weather map having a range from a source of weather map data for a geographic area. The computerized system includes a wireless client device including a processor and client software executable by the processor to receive user input from the input device including a zoom-in or zoom-out command for dynamically changing the range of the customized weather map. The computerized system further includes a server system including server software executable by the server system to receive a server request for weather map data and to produce multiple customized weather maps. One or more of the customized weather maps provides a zoom-in or zoom-out feature for dynamically changing the range of the customized weather map on the wireless client device. The zoom-in or zoom-out feature recited in claim 34 refers to a feature of the map that enables a user to dynamically change the range of the map from one range to another range. By dynamic, applicants mean without sending a new request to the server.

In contrast, Obradovich merely discloses enabling a user to choose the scale of the map requested from the server. The scale of the map is a fixed feature of the map once it is downloaded from the server. In order to change the scale of the displayed map, a new request would need to be sent from the PCD to a data provider, and a new map would need to be transmitted to the PCD. *See e.g.* column 12, lines 22-27. Obradovich does not disclose or suggest client software executable by the processor to receive user input from the input device including a zoom-in or zoom-out command for dynamically changing the range of the customized weather map. Rather, a user may choose an initial range for a map, but cannot change the range of the map.

For at least these reasons, therefore, Obradovich does not anticipate or suggest claim 34. Claims 35-41 depend from claim 34 and are allowable for at least the same reasons. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of claims 34-41.

Claim 42, as amended, recites, in part, a computerized method for producing a customized weather map from a source of weather map data. The computerized method includes

sending a request to a server for weather map data and producing multiple customized weather maps. The computerized method further includes modifying the customized weather map to indicate at least one location of personal interest to a user. The location of personal interest is obtained from a database stored on the server.

Obradovich does not anticipate or suggest claim 42, therefore, for at least the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 28. Claims 43-47 depend from claim 42 and are allowable for at least the same reasons. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of claims 42-47.

Claim 62, as amended, recites, in part, a computerized system for producing a customized weather map from a source of weather map data. The computerized system includes a server system coupled to receive weather map data from the source of weather map data. The server system includes server software executable by the server system to receive a server request for weather map data, to store a list of location of personal interest to a user, and to produce a customized weather map. The server software is further executable to modify the customized weather map to indicate at least one of the locations of personal interest to the user.

Obradovich does not anticipate or suggest claim 62, therefore, for at least the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 28. Claims 63-69 depend from claim 62 and are allowable for at least the same reasons. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of claims 62-69.

Claim 70, as amended, recites, in part, a computerized method for producing a customized weather map from a source of weather map data. The computerized method includes obtaining a particular type of weather map data from the source of weather map data and creating a customized weather map. The customized weather map indicates at least one location of personal interest to the user.

Obradovich does not anticipate or suggest claim 70, therefore, for at least the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 28. Claims 71-73 depend from claim 70 and are allowable for at least the same reasons. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of claims 70-73.

Section 103 Rejections

Claims 20-27 and 74-80 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Obradovich in view of Chuang (US 2002/0113826, hereinafter "Chuang"). Applicants respectfully assert that the rejection is overcome.

Claim 20, as amended, recites, in part, a computerized system for producing a customized weather map from a source of weather data. The computerized system includes a server system coupled to receive weather map data from the source of weather map data. The server system includes server software executable by the server system to store a list of locations personal to the user, the list of personal locations including a latitude and longitude of each personal location.

Obradovich does not anticipate or suggest claim 20, therefore, for at least the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 28. Chuang does not overcome the shortcomings of Obradovich. Rather, Chuang relates to a system for simultaneously displaying weather data and monitored device data. Monitored device data include data regarding the status of a monitored device. Chuang does not disclose or suggest server software to store a list of locations personal to the user. For at least these reasons, therefore, Obradovich would not lead a person having skill in the art to the invention of claim 20, even in view of Chuang. Claims 22-27 depend from claim 20 and are allowable for at least the same reasons. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of claims 20-27.

Claim 74, as amended, recites, in part, a computerized method for producing a customized weather map from at least one source of weather map data. The computerized method includes sending a request from a client device to a server for weather map data, obtaining a base map, obtaining geo-temporal data corresponding to the base map from a second source, and producing a first customized weather map by combining the geo-temporal data and the base map on the server. The computerized method further includes obtaining locations of personal interest to the user and modifying the first customized weather map to indicate the predetermined locations of personal interest to the user.

Obradovich does not anticipate or suggest claim 74, therefore, for at least the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 28. Chuang does not overcome the shortcomings of Obradovich for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim

20. For at least these reasons, therefore, Obradovich would not lead a person having skill in the art to the invention of claim 74, even in view of Chuang. Claims 75 and 77-82 depend from claim 74 and are allowable for at least the same reasons. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of claims 74, 75, and 76-82.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would advance the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903
(612) 332-5300

Date: November 7, 2005



Erik G. Swenson
Reg. No. 45,147
EGS/JKS/jt